

## Examine r report

**Criterion A: (4)** The **real-life situation**, which is placed at **the very start**, is an excellent one. The **KL** is also excellent, though it might have **been highlighted** more when introduced. A little more time explaining the link **between the real-life example and the KL** would have made the presentation stronger.

**Criterion B: (3)** A **grasp of the KI** is shown through a structure **that introduces three AOKs (human science, ethics and mathematics)**. However, a deeper exploration of, and **inquiry into**, these areas was needed.

**Criterion C: (4)** The **presentation** was a little dry and could **have made clearer**

both the student's engagement and the significance of the subject. Nevertheless, the former was demonstrated in the student's response in the question time, while the latter was implicit in much that was said, particularly the examples.

**Criterion D: (3)** Different perspectives were represented particularly through the AOKs economics and ethics, and through the consideration of the perspectives of both the trafficker and the victim. Although there was some implicit comparison, the presenter could have picked up on opportunities to explore the connections and contrasts of these perspectives more deeply.

Overall ... This presentation starts off in excellent fashion with a real-life situation, and raises from it an interesting question about the role of incomplete knowledge in human trafficking, for both the trafficker and the victim. However, despite introducing some good links to AOKs, and asking some interesting supplementary questions, the student misses several chances to deepen the inquiry. As the presentation is quite short, there was ample time to do this. A well-constructed presentation was thus weakened by a lack of detail.

5.40

throughout

**C** in response to a question, explains why the **issue** matters to her. Use any opportunities given by audience questions to deepen your TOK inquiry.

**C** deals with the issues somewhat theoretically, with only two examples that are not explored sufficiently. Make sure your interest and involvement in the KI is obvious.

Time Comment

6.25

Time Comment

**B** agrees with questioner that human trafficking is the modern slavery, but merely by saying "yes" [see 5.40].



In this presentation, the students  
ought to believe in Darwinism or  
creationism, through a specific real-  
situation: the call in the USA for  
elligent design to be taught in science  
rooms.





Time	Comment
9.05	state that science has the stronger position, but neither side has conclusive proof, without investigating why. Defend judgments you make between perspectives with analysis.
9.15	state that truth arises from within a paradigm, and that it is up to the individual to choose [see 5.15].
9.50	mention the strength of scientific support for Darwinism, but do not outline or evaluate that support [see 9.05].
10.10	Conclude the main body of the presentation and invite questions.
10.35	clarify their KI.
11.15	respond to several questions by discussing in further detail several WOKs and AOKs Use audience questions to deepen your argument.

Time	Comment
4.40	claim, without expansion, a link between science and explanation [see 3.20].
5.15	make several interesting claims; that, if one knows the truth, then no proof is required, and that God created the means of scientific proof. interesting claims (C) should be queried and defended (B).
5.40	discuss the role play, analysing arguments and identifying fallacies. Self-aware reflection on the real-life situation is essential to a good treatment of the KI.
6.45	identify but do not critique their assumptions; if we take one perspective (for example the scientific) therefore we are not objective. Identify and explore your assumptions.
7.20	link the WOKs reason and language by identifying emotive language (religion = virus, fairytale).
8.50	advance their own opinions on the KI, drawing on the discussion. After considering possible answers to the KI, you can make your own considered view clear, and defend it.

# Presentation planning document

Submit to: TOK teacher

Arrival date: See below

Session

School name: .....

- Write legibly using black ink and retain a copy of this form.
- Complete this form in the working language of your school (English, French or Spanish).
- Do not send to IB Cardiff or to the moderator unless you have been instructed to do so. Retain the forms until after the publication of results.

Candidate name: *Presenter 6*

Candidate session number:

0	0						
---	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Title of presentation: *Darwinism vs Creationism*

Please describe your planning for the presentation, either in the space below, or on an attached A4 word-processed page by completing 1, 2 and 3 below.

1. What is the real life situation under consideration?

*Intelligent design being taught as science in American schools*

Reasonable real-life situation, though it could be made more specific, by referring to a particular school or district and filling in some detail.

2. What is the TOK knowledge issue that will be the focus of your presentation? (This must be expressed as a question.)

*Do we believe in intelligent design or Science? Is intelligent design a science?*

Although these are reasonable KIs, they were not the ones mentioned in the presentation.



3. Write a summary in note form (for example, a bullet point list), of the way you plan to deal with knowledge issues during your presentation).

## Religion VS Science

### Resources

- Documentary Richard Dawkins
- Matt's Dad (Scientist)
- Elliot's "Dad" (Priest)

### Points to make

- Is a school morally responsible for advocating scientific/religious classes as truth

- Both lack sufficient evidence to be proven
- Recognise Paradigms

### Presentation

- Intro to topic (i.e. recognition of paradigms, definition of terms Intelligent Design, Creationism and Darwinism)
- Role Play
- Show clip of argument
- Discuss fallacies in each argument as well as knowledge issues
- Finish with personal opinion

### Arguments

Incorporate these in the plan (above).

### Darwinism (Matt)

- Religion is blinding society from the truth that we live in an age of science not religion (emotive language)
- Intelligent design being taught in a scientific context, this imposes religion upon the youth
- Religion is like a virus, plaguing the people of the world and preventing them from progressing in a scientific world (emotive language)

### Religion (Elliot)

- Argue that religion is the be all and end all, there is no point in studying material things when it is god who created everything, including science (circular argument)
- It should be taught instead of the Darwinism theory because of the reasons previously stated.

This planning document reads more like a brainstorm than a plan. There are many good ideas here, but they needed to be organized into a running order. Some of the ideas did not make it into the presentation.

Put these in the presentation order, and briefly map out how they will be developed.

# Presentation marking form (TK/PMF)

Presenter's assessment

Criterion	Comments/evidence	Achievement level (/5)
A	Knowledge issue could have been focused on more	4
B	Enjoyed role play, was good way to show arguments	4
C	Was a good example of personal views	5
D	Should have mentioned other points of view	3
TOTAL (/20)		16

Two perspectives are sufficient, if well analysed.

Need to concentrate on quality of the arguments rather than the enjoyment.

Accurate, self-reflective comment.



**Criterion A: (3) The KI—ought we to**

believe in Darwinism or Creationism?—is made reasonably clear, though not stated explicitly during the main body of the presentation. They are able to express it more clearly in the question period. The real-life situation is briefly articulated, with some expansion and exploration through the role play. It could have been explained early, and the links to the KI made more explicit.

**Criterion B: (3) Throughout the**

presentation the students make, sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly, a number of interesting claims regarding the relation of science, religion, and important TOK terms such as proof, faith, evidence, explanation and truth. However, these opportunities for deeper analysis and reflection are too often passed over. They do a better job on the WOK reason, exploring a number of fallacies of reasoning.

**Criterion C: (5) The perspectives of the two**

students as knowers come through quite

clearly, conveyed in a number of ways. In explaining their own "paradigms", they link their inquiry to their upbringing and experiences. After the role play, they explain and defend their own positions on the issue. Finally, in answer to the first question, they speak about why this issue seemed important to them.

**Criterion D: (4) Two different perspectives**

are clearly set out through the role play, and each is developed in some detail. The similarities and differences between them are a little less well explored, and a shallow assertion that it is merely a personal choice which you believe is neither analysed nor defended. There is a tendency to consider the two perspectives as mutually exclusive, though this is acknowledged and explored a little in the question time.

**Overall ...**

This pair presentation starts with a good real-life situation and develops it through a role play. However, they rely on their

scripts to a degree that is in danger of breaching the TOK rules. By connecting to their own upbringing, they are able to show their personal involvement. The role play is quite rich, and raises quite a number of interesting knowledge claims (which could be more explicitly stated). However, the opportunity to analyse these is too often missed, both in the role play itself and in the discussion of the role play (with the exception of some solid analysis of arguments and fallacies). As a whole, the presentation lacks a consistent focus, and this springs in part from a failure to be sufficiently explicit about the KI, and partly from a failure to structure their plan. With 20 minutes available for a pair presentation, there was time to do better. The pair are fortunate that they are asked questions that enable them to come back and expand their analysis later. They do use several good techniques to acknowledge their knowers' perspectives and bring them to the fore.



Within this presentation, the contentious moral issue of honour killings is treated with sensitivity and fine awareness of complexity. The student is admirable in her ability to balance an even-handed consideration of diverse perspectives with coming to a well-supported and principled personal view.

Honor Killing: nothing honorable about it!

[Presentation 7, from May 2008]

This presentation achieved 17/20, a grade B

Time	Comment
0.20	<p>↓ C</p> <p>avoids stereotyped or simplistic views by recognizing that honour killings occur in religions other than Islam and are at times carried out on men.</p> <p>Show personal insight through careful analysis.</p>
1.25	<p>↑ A</p> <p>implicitly refers to three possible KIs: what are the effects of culture and education on how humans interpret a situation? how is evidence used to justify accusations of wrongdoing? and what are the evidential bases for the claim that there are honour killings? None are stated clearly and explicitly.</p> <p>Choose a solid KI and make your statement of the KI prominent.</p>
1.30	<p>↑ A</p> <p>does not start with a real-life situation, but rather with a topic and some implicit knowledge issues.</p> <p>Derive your KI from a real-life situation.</p>
2.25	<p>↓ B</p> <p>refers to limitations of a human science (which we can identify as sociology) in the claim that honour killings are under-reported.</p> <p>Show awareness of methodological difficulties in AOKs, backed with reasons.</p>
2.50	<p>↓ B</p> <p>gives a brief and succinct account of the cultural and historical roots of honour killings.</p> <p>Provide necessary information without taking up too much of the presentation to set up the TOK inquiry to come.</p>
3.30	<p>↓ D</p> <p>recognizes the difficulties of separating out the interaction of religion and culture.</p> <p>An understanding of the complexity of the KI can be shown through acknowledging the complex and ambiguous connections between AOKs.</p>
3.55	<p>↓ C</p> <p>comments that considering the KI as an instance of violence against women helps avoid the hasty generalization of a racist interpretation.</p> <p>Show your personal insight into the poor use of the WOK reason by identifying fallacies.</p>
4.20	<p>↓ B</p> <p>discusses emotion and its effect on reasoning, and then on the interpretation of visual perceptions.</p> <p>Show your understanding of the complex interplay of WOKs—but name the WOKs explicitly.</p>